A certain section of the oppressed nation petty bourgeoisie therefore joins the revolution, but only to reach out for unrealized class ambitions, only to try and step up on the revolution; joins the armed struggle, but only to try and use it against itself. This revisionism is neo-colonial in that it sees the goal of revolution and independence as a new "junior partnership" with imperialism. They don't want to be imperialism's servants, but its partners.

HOW REVISIONISM USES ARMED STRUGGLE AGAINST THE ARMED STRUGGLE

PART I

S1

Originally published in *Series One: Research Papers, Historical Analysis, and Current Investigation*, April 1983

Cover: Traitor Luis Taruc (right), one-time commander of the Huk army, surrenders to puppet officers in the Philippines, 1954

helped promote Taruc's cover-up, he now says, **because he personally decided that Taruc should be made "a symbol" of the Philippine revolution.** This is interesting.

Why should euro-amerikans have decided who should be promoted as "leaders" of the Filipino revolution? Why should a euro-amerikan be in a position to cover-up for misleaders, making them look good? Why was he "better" than Filipinos for writing their propaganda? Pomeroy himself admits his presence was a strain on the fighters. Some, he admits, were always suspicious of him. Others always called him "sir" and deferred to him since he was a colonial "master." Pomeroy himself is a minor matter, primarily important in that his destructive role reveals how deeply neo-colonial attitudes had infected not just a few leaders but the body of the armed movement.

We say that "defeated armies learn well." Today a new Communist Party and a New People's Army are waging People's War in the Philippines. Defeat, we say, is primarily a product of internal contradictions. The phonograph record of "repression was too heavy" and "the imperialists were too strong"—at best meaningless statements—should be smashed. It is time to advance our understanding to a new level, and thus to prepare for new seasons of struggle that lie ahead. The example of revisionism in the Huk struggle is only one aspect of this phenomenon. In our own day revisionism and neo-colonialism have found new roles even in military victory and national liberation. We will go deeper into this.

TO BE CONTINUED

---

resumption of parliamentary struggle." That is why the lives of so many fighters were thrown away in military adventures that had no future.

What is most interesting is this ex-PKP leader's assertion that even if they had accidentally succeeded in seizing power, their new government would have been pro-capitalist: "Full democratic rights would be guaranteed, including the rights of private enterprise. Foreign investments, including American investment, would have been permitted..."

5. This revisionism within the Filipino socialist cadres was, in fact, another variant of neo-colonialism. While the Lava-Taruc cliques were verbally pro-Moscow, they were really much more influenced by amerika. Their closest international ties were not to the more advanced communist movements of Asia. They chose instead to become closest to the Communist Party USA, the revisionist party of the colonizing oppressor nation. This is why protracted war and other communist concepts were so foreign to their party. In the age of imperialism, revisionism has national characteristics. Their closest allies were from the oppressor nation, rather than from other national liberation movements.

As an interesting example, the ex-PKP leader we've quoted is perhaps the most widely-read "authority" internationally on the Filipino struggle of the Huk period. He is not himself a Filipino. He is a euro-amerikan named William Pomeroy, an ex-G.I. and a CPUSA journalist who joined the top leadership of the PKP and became head of propaganda. Pomeroy's skill at revisionist schemes and lies made him very valuable to the Lavas and Tarucs. In fact, he wrote an "autobiography" for Luis Taruc, former Huk commander during World War II, in which Taruc sounds like a very modest but dedicated communist. Taruc was, as history has shown, really an opportunist and a traitor to his people. Pomeroy

HOW REVISIONISM USES ARMED STRUGGLE AGAINST THE ARMED STRUGGLE
PART I

I. We must develop a stronger analysis of revisionism and neo-colonialism, and in particular a concrete analysis of their current relationship to the armed struggle. It is dangerous (and for many comrades already fatal) to view things as "simple as Black and white." It is very dangerous to look upon revisionism and neo-colonialism as political trends which, being opposed to revolution, are thought of only as existing **outside** the revolution. This problem becomes most visible in the guerrilla wars of national liberation in the oppressed nations, particularly as imperialism decays and weakens.

Our conception of revisionism has been the traditional one of petty-bourgeois social democracy. Social democracy tries to limit the mass struggle to election campaigns, to welfare legislation, and to conceptions of socialism through gradual reforms rather than the revolutionary seizure of state power. Since the split in the world socialist camp, many have simply used "revisionist" to designate any and all pro-Russian socialists. In a similar fashion, neo-colonialism is exemplified by Lon Nol in Cambodia, Mobutu in Zaire, Andrew Young in Atlanta, and other blatantly pro-u.s. puppet bourgeois. This is true as far as it goes. It does not, however, encompass enough. Revisionism in the era of national liberation has a neo-colonial character in both the oppressor and oppressed nations.

When communists speak of revisionism we mean "the voice of the petty bourgeoisie within the proletarian movement." To explain: There was a time, in the origins of european socialism, when the petty bourgeoisie of the various nations had their own

class programs, their own political parties and movements. The political division between the petty bourgeoisie and the young proletariat was very distinct, even though a tiny handful of radicalized intellectuals from the privileged classes had joined the proletarian movement.

This was transformed by the polarization of classes and nations as capitalism matured. In Western europe the late 19th-century petty bourgeoisie, once a large class with numerous political parties of its own, was pushed down closer to the masses by emerging monopoly capitalism. The independence of small shopkeepers, intellectuals, small entrepreneurs was pared down. Many were ruined economically and forced even further down into the army of wage laborers. Increasingly, therefore, large numbers of the petty bourgeoisie entered the proletarian movement. Not only were they filled by resentment against monopoly capital, but with the historic decline of their class they had come to recognize the mass power of the oppressed classes as the best instrument to reclaim their lost privileges.

By the 1920s the petty-bourgeois political parties of Western europe had faded, pushed aside by the polarization of capitalist politics there into large bourgeois parties and large working-class parties. Even today in nations such as England and West Germany the great political parties are the Conservative vs. the "Labor" or "Social-Democratic" revisionist parties, while the centrist petty-bourgeois parties (such as the Liberal Party in England and the Free Democrats in West Germany) are small remainders.

Thus, while the proletarian masses wanted socialism and revolution, the influx of radicalized petty bourgeois in the european social-democratic parties in Lenin's day favored positions in parliament, inflated trade-union bureaucracies, and bourgeois reformism. Their special base was the new labor aristocracies, created out of

The Re-Establishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines

The most significant development so far in the Philippine revolution is the re-establishment of the Communist Party of the Philippines under the supreme guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. **The Party was re-established on December 26, 1968** after several years of criticism and self-criticism conducted by both old and young proletarian revolutionaries.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines, the people's guerrillas were transformed into the **New People's Army on March 29, 1969.** In the meeting of Red commanders and fighters, the Taruc-Sumulong gangster clique was repudiated as a counter-revolutionary remnant of the old...bourgeois gang of the Lavas and Tarucs. The Red commanders and fighters issued a document of rectification, "The New People's Army," and promulgated the Rules of the New People's Army.

—Jose Sison

aim in 1948 when they formed the HMB was **"to build up bargaining strength."** He says that despite what the fighters were led to believe, **"There was no insurrectionary plan, and the effort was made to employ the expanding strength of the Huks as a lever to attain a democratic peace, for the**

trustingly submitting a roster of Huk names. Later it was used as a blacklist to persecute and murder our comrades." The particular petty-bourgeois class goals of the Lavas and Tarucs placed them objectively on the side of imperialism, **even though they were in the leadership of the national liberation struggle.**

This was proven in 1948, when they did the precise same betrayal all over again. Puppet President Quirino was frightened at the growth of revolution, and put forward a trick to discredit and disorganize the armed struggle. He proposed a truce and negotiations, offering as proof of his good intentions to reinstate the PKP leaders in the colonial legislature with "back pay." Quirino vaguely hinted that he might even be willing to come over and join the PKP in setting up a new nationalist government. All he asked in return was that the HMB start sending in its troops to disarm and identify themselves to the police while the talks started.

The revisionist PKP leadership, represented by the traitor Luis Taruc, gladly accepted, rushing to get their checks and government privileges. Huk fighters registering with the police were told: "We'll take care of you later." **Colonial police and agents were allowed to visit guerrilla camps and identify Party cadre.** After two months the imperialists had enough, and broke up the charade. The PKP envoys were shot down. Mass terrorism and arrests took place throughout the islands. Even after months of renewed fighting, the PKP still continued to do imperialism's work of discrediting the People's War by offering publicly to support the puppet government in return for "civil liberties."

Both the revisionists and the fighters wanted a movement, both took part in armed resistance—but their goals were completely different. According to one of the top PKP leaders, their main

colonial super-profits. This was the original, classic revisionism of the late 19th century, which still exists to this very moment on a world scale—"the voice of the petty bourgeoisie within the proletarian movement."

Imperialism also polarized the world in terms of nations, we must remember. In the oppressed nations of Afrika, Asia, Latin Amerika and north amerika, imperialism by brute force crushed the ambitions of the native petty bourgeoisie in the same measure as it enslaved their whole nations. Anti-colonial movements arose that represented and embraced the whole oppressed nation, all classes and sectors. Democratic multi-class movements have always been a normal form for revolutionary upheaval.

To understand that revolution brings together a number of classes—and that national liberation unites in an oppressed nation "**All its various classes, except for some traitors**" (Mao Zedong) makes the question of scientifically identifying specific class politics not less important (as some think) but even more so. It should be clearly understood that all classes have their own distinctive ideological outlooks and their own social goals, even when united in a struggle of national liberation.

The petty bourgeoisie in the oppressed nations has revolutionary tendencies, and some go over to communism and the oppressed. Neo-colonial tendencies are also quite strong in this class. Some petty bourgeois of the oppressed nations, like the neo-colonial bureaucrats and puppet officers who serve the imperialists for pay, are traitors to the nation. More dangerous than these, in our opinion, are the revisionists who strive to use national liberation and socialism to carry out even more grandiose neo-colonial ambitions. This is at the cutting edge of what is now being struggled out.*

* Revisionism in the oppressor nations has a neo-colonial character

A certain section of the oppressed nation petty bourgeoisie therefore joins the revolution, but only to reach out for unrealized class ambitions, only to try and step up on the revolution; joins the armed struggle, but only to try and use it against itself. This revisionism is neo-colonial in that it sees the goal of revolution and independence as a new "junior partnership" with imperialism. They don't want to be imperialism's servants, but its partners. We can list the main aspects of this (these are not opposed to each other, and often coexist in one situation):

1. Supporting the armed struggle in only a tactical sense, while trying to head it off. Armed struggle, as we know, represents the will of the oppressed masses who desire to throw off their oppressors. Often the masses spontaneously turn to uprisings, to picking up the gun, even without organization or leadership. Often the revolutionary cadres correctly join their brothers and sisters in fighting back against the death squads and puppet troops. When the masses move forward into struggle revisionists must go along or risk falling off from their position atop the movement. This "going along" is only tactical and temporary.

2. Using armed struggle only as the ultimate "bargaining chip," as leverage to force Washington to make a better deal with "native" bourgeois and petty-bourgeois interests. Dialectically, they see the objective of armed revolution as a more harmonious relationship with imperialism. This is difficult for many cadre to understand.

3. In cases such as Algeria, Zimbabwe, Palestine, etc. imperialism historically imported a european settler occupation to hold the colony. Here even revisionism is forced, however unhappily, to admit that outright military victory and transfer of state power

in that it attempts to co-opt the anti-colonial uprisings, bringing them under its reformist hegemony and hence under the continued domination of oppressor nation elements (the "good whites").

> executed. But these over-extended the strength of the people's army. On October 18, the enemy counter-attacked by raiding all central offices of the Party in Manila, arresting among others the Politburo led by Jose Lava. Subsequently, campaigns of encirclement and suppression were launched in the countryside against the thinly-spread people's army. Over-extended lines of supply and communication of the People's Liberation Army became easy targets of the reactionary armed forces. Because of its putschist orientation, the Jose Lava leadership brought the most crushing defeats on the Party and the people's army."

By 1955 the uprising had been ended. Luis Taruc, Huk commander against the Japanese and one of the most famous guerrilla leaders, had surrendered in 1954. Like Eldridge Cleaver, Taruc experienced a "miraculous" religious conversion and decided that God wanted him to "turn" (he has worked as a propagandist for the puppet regime ever since). In 1955 PKP Secretary Jesus Lava ordered the cadres to pull in from the jungles and concentrate on elections. Some units resisted, although in the isolation many were driven into the "roving bandit" life just for food and survival. The Party as a force for the national liberation was dead.

4. This stunning mismanagement and widespread treason in the upper ranks of the People's War was not an accident. It was a question of politics. The No. 1 objective of the Lavas and Tarucs was to use the struggle to propel themselves into careerist bourgeois respectability. In 1946, for example, these misleaders tried to win the approval of the u.s. government by giving it the list of all the underground Huk fighters! An ex-PKP leader writes: "As part of our peaceful legal struggle we decided to apply for back pay... Actually we proved drastically short-sighted in so

It is hard to believe how badly the PKP leadership mismanaged the war. So hard, in fact, that most comrades here assume, without investigating, that the Huks did their best but were just overwhelmed by superior u.s. power. Such explanations, laying defeat to external factors outside the revolution, can be a narcotic, soothing the troubled mind into pacification. The Lava-Turac leadership rejected Mao Zedong's doctrine of protracted war, demanding instead that the fighters spend their lives bringing them instant victory. Since victory was supposedly only months away, the PKP leadership saw no need to give military training, to use landmines, highway barricades, economic sabotage or any of the other tactics already proven in Vietnam. Sison writes of this stage:

> "After the 1949 elections, the Jose Lava leadership took the line that it could seize power within two years and for this purpose prepared a timetable of military operations and rapid recruitment into the Party. Without relying mainly on the strength of the Party and the people's army and without rectifying a long period of compromises with u.s. imperialism and the local reactionaries, the Jose Lava leadership considered as basic factors for the victory of the Philippine revolution such external conditions as the 'certainty' of a third world war, the economic recession in the united states and the liberation of the Chinese people... In January 1950, the adventurist line of quick military victory was formally put forward by the Jose Lava leadership through resolutions of the Party Political Bureau.
>
> "All units of the people's army were ordered to make simultaneous attacks on provincial capitals, cities and enemy camps on March 29, August 26 and November 7, 1950. The attacks of March 29 and August 26 were

is necessary. Nothing less will blast out the entrenched settler regime that is unwilling to share with the oppressed nation petty bourgeoisie. Here their objective is a "liberated" nation for themselves to head, with the national petty bourgeoisie substituting themselves for the old settler regime in being imperialism's local partners.

4. In some oppressed nations, such as El Salvador, the imperialist counter-insurgency is so murderous and unrestrained that even those reformist political elements opposed to revolution have been forced to take shelter within the guerrilla front. Within the five fighting organizations of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMNLF) and the larger "mass" alliance of the Democratic Revolutionary Front (DRF), there are forces that advocate protracted People's War to socialism—and there are forces which say that their only goal is to restore bourgeois democracy and friendship with the u.s.a. This is quite a distance apart in roads to be taken. By the way, it is no secret which side is getting the most support from the "movement" in the u.s.

For instance, Commander Roberto Roca, leader of the guerrilla Revolutionary Party of Central America, says publicly that his party would lay down its arms and accept the Salvadoran fascist military if only the latter would permit bourgeois election campaigns: "We took up arms because the political struggle was not possible in El Salvador. **If there is political pluralism, there's no need for the military struggle.**" If there is not a secret cooperation between imperialism and some of these elements then there soon will be. Communists should understand these matters now, rather than years from now.

II. We can see how this revisionist penetration of the armed struggle works by the actual history of the Huk uprising in the

Philippines between 1946–1955. This is one of the great popular struggles in modern Asian history. After conducting guerrilla war against the Japanese invasion during World War II, thousands of Filipino communist workers and peasants took up arms again to overthrow u.s. colonial rule. Ten years later, despite heroic sacrifices by fighters and activists of all ages, the Hukbong Mapagpalaya ng Bayan (HMB or People's Liberation Army) had been crushed by the puppet forces of the neo-colonial Republic of the Philippines (led by the c.i.a.'s Major Edward Lansdale). At a time when Asian People's Wars in China and Vietnam were well on the road to victory, the defeat in the Philippines was a revealing contrast.

1. The Huk guerrilla movement was born in the Japanese invasion period. Close to 100,000 Filipinos took part in the Communist guerrilla struggle against the Japanese, as couriers, organizers, supply porters, spies and armed fighters.* Some 20,000 Japanese soldiers and puppets were killed by the guerrillas, who by the War's end governed large sections of their nation. Jose Sison, leader of the new Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP), writes:

"To themselves principally, the Filipino people owe their liberation from the Japanese imperialist invaders... It was not u.s. imperialism which liberated the Philippines. u.s. imperialism merely returned to reimpose its colonial rule. In fact, it concentrated its air bombardment and artillery fire on the Filipino people and their homes in late 1944 and early 1945 to pave the way for their resubjugation." (*Philippine Society and Revolution*)

The u.s. Empire was not anti-fascist and the Filipino national bourgeoisie was treacherously submissive to foreign rule. The u.s.

* There were also some guerrilla units led by the u.s. military, generally known as "USAFFE" forces (United States Armed Forces Far East).

> u.s. imperialism in their desire to occupy high positions in the puppet reactionary government. So the headquarters of the Party was moved out of the countryside to the city. They organized the Democratic Alliance so that it could help u.s. imperialism put up a sham republic. They converted the HUKBALAHAP into the Huk Veterans' League and thus put the people at the mercy of the enemy. The people's committees, tempered by the anti-fascist war, were turned into mere chapters of a legal peasant association and these were used to spread the false illusion that land reform could fall from the palms of the enemy."

For three years the PKP revisionist leadership tried to advance itself in bourgeois elections and various deals, while the root and branch of the movement increasingly was driven underground and returned to armed struggle. By 1948 there were 10,000–12,000 Red fighters, and in Central Luzon over 150,000 active supporters. Finally, in May 1948 the PKP Central Committee called upon the people to view the guerrilla war as the main form of struggle. That meeting officially reconstituted the Huk forces as the People's Liberation Army (HMB). So for the second time in seven years the revolutionary struggle of the Filipino people forced a reluctant leadership to enter the zone of war. The revisionist leadership found it necessary to control the increasing military activity of the cadres and masses.

3. The defeat of the HMB was not inevitable. Sison, looking back, points out that: **"The objective conditions for waging a protracted people's war were extremely favorable."** The difference between Vietnam and the Philippines was primarily a difference of political-military leadership. The HMB was defeated because of the utterly incompetent and traitorous decisions of the Lava-Taruc leadership, which threw away the sacrifices of Red fighters as though they were nothing.

surprised when after the battle the u.s. troops turned their guns on them and disarmed them. In Manila, the imperialist aggressors also disarmed and turned back units of the HUKBALAHAP that had preceded them. Squadron 77, a unit of the people's army, was massacred in Malolos, Bulacan while on its way from Manila after being disarmed.

"To suppress the Filipino people, u.s. imperialism put together under its Military Police Command its USAFFE puppets and the erstwhile pro-Japanese Philippine Constabulary. It encouraged the traitor landlords to take back full control over the lands that they had left during the war, to demand rent arrears from the peasants and to organize private armed gangs, then known as the civilian guards, to enforce their class rule in coordination with the military police. In their attempt to dissolve the provincial and municipal governments established by the Party and people's army, the u.s. imperialists and the landlords unleashed a campaign of white terror against the people. The general headquarters of the HUKBALAHAP in San Fernando, Pampanga was raided by the u.s. Counter-Intelligence Corps. Mass arrests and imprisonment of Party cadres, Red fighters and common people were made all over Central Luzon. Massacres, assassinations, torture and other forms of atrocities were perpetrated by the military police and civilian guards.

"So incensed were the people that they wanted to fight back and continue the people's war. But the...bourgeois gang of the Lavas and Tarucs insisted on the line that the people were tired of war and that a campaign for 'democratic peace' was called for. The hidden traitors within the Party hailed the fake independence promised by

Empire had invaded the Philippines in 1898, holding it as a u.s. colony since then. Since Japanese colonial rule simply replaced u.s. colonial rule in 1942, the Philippines under their invasion continued just as before. Japanese "fascism" was exactly the same as u.s. "democracy." The former u.s. puppets promptly became Japanese puppets. The Philippine Constabulary (PCs), amerika's puppet counter-insurgency police, went on as before only under Japanese commanders. The majority of the u.s. colonial "Commonwealth" legislature served in the new Japanese puppet government. Even the laws stayed the same. A State Department official commented: "Under Japanese military occupation the Philippine Islands have been governed very largely under the same laws and by much the same men as under the Commonwealth."

Of necessity, then, the u.s. "liberation" of the Philippines in 1945 meant a repressive campaign against the new national liberation movement. As a general rule, the u.s. government in 1945–46 assumed that those puppet elements who had profited by collaborating with the Japanese would be good u.s. servants, while those peasants, workers and intellectuals who had taken part in the armed struggle under communist leadership should be repressed.

For their No. 1 Filipino puppet, u.s. commander Gen. Douglas MacArthur picked Manuel Roxas. In April 1945 Roxas was made a Brigadier General of u.s. colonial troops, and attached to Gen. MacArthur's staff as a figurehead. In 1946 he was installed by u.s. imperialism as the first post-war Philippine President. Roxas had become infamous in his role as chief of rice procurement for the Japanese occupation (seizing rice from Filipinos), becoming a cabinet minister in the Japanese puppet regime. Indeed, u.s. intelligence itself described Roxas as "an exonerated collaborationist." This was the u.s. "Liberation" of the Philippines from "fascism."

While the Red Army in China and the Viet Minh in Vietnam had resisted similar reintroductions of Western colonialism, the Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas (PKP) surrendered in 1945 to u.s. reinvasion. The strong Huk armed units were told to follow u.s. orders and even to disband. This is from a distance hard for many to believe. The old Filipino Communist Party (PKP) had been founded the same year as the Indochinese Communist Party—1930—but instead of Hos and Giaps the PKP leadership was dominated by revisionists.

2. The pressure for guerrilla war of national liberation came in all instances from the Filipino people and from the revolutionary cadres in the field. In 1942, despite the favorable turmoil of the imperialist war, the revisionist PKP leadership refused to start armed struggle. Refusing to leave Manila, the capital, the revisionists "maneuvered to preoccupy the Party leadership with bourgeois parliamentarianism, pacifism and civil liberties" (Sison). Three weeks after the Japanese seizure of Manila the PKP leaders were arrested, still refusing to begin a military front. The communist cadres, in the confusion that followed, convened a secret conference of the General Luzon Bureau (Luzon is the main island in the Philippine archipelago) in the Spring of 1942, which founded the guerrilla Hukbo ng Bayan Laban sa Hapon (People's Anti-Japanese Army).

The People's War was thus born from below, against the original plans of the revisionist leaders. Everywhere in Luzon peasants and workers picked up the gun. Japanese convoys were ambushed. The rice crops of collaborationist landlords were liberated and redistributed to the masses. New People's Governments were set up in some areas. Even then the revisionists tried to head off the popular guerrilla movement, to water down the movement so it could be controlled. In 1943 they passed the "retreat for defense" policy, which broke up the Huk units into small 3–5

person teams. These were too small to fight, and could only run and hide in a "survivalist" way. Individual survival was promoted even at the price of military helplessness. Angry cadre forced the PKP Central Committee to repudiate this traitorous policy.

At the same time the revisionists politically misled the masses and the guerrillas. One PKP leader admits: "Throughout the war we had nothing but praise for the Americans, and had done everything possible to bring about a pro-American feeling..." How can you fight an anti-colonial war while your leadership is promoting neo-colonial loyalty to imperialism? Jose Sison writes:

> "...the Party had liberated almost the entire region of Central Luzon, had organized provincial and municipal governments and had dispatched armed units to Manila and Southern Luzon.
>
> "There was however no ideological and political preparation against the return of u.s. imperialism and the reimposition of feudalism in the countryside. Consistently acting as the instrument of u.s. imperialism within the Party, the...Lavas and Tarucs harped on loyalty to the u.s. government and the puppet commonwealth government and hoped to engage in parliamentary struggle under the dispensation of these monsters. Yet, u.s. imperialism and the local exploiting classes were determined to attack the Party, the people's army and the people with real bullets as well as with sugar-coated ones.
>
> "...the HUKBALAHAP welcomed the u.s. imperialist troops that marched through Central Luzon from Lingayen in 1945. Some units of the people's army fought together with the u.s. imperialist troops in dislodging the Japanese troops from the Floridablanca airfields but were